

Comments from Pre-Proposal Meeting

Harrisonburg, Virginia
October 1, 2002

MR. SMITH: Sure. My name is Jay Smith. I'm with a group called SMART Solutions, a coalition made up of manufacturers, businesses and industries in the area. One of our co-chairs of our coalition is Mike Tisdell from Coors Brewing Company in Elkton and he's asked that I read a brief statement into the record for him. Mike Tisdell is the business unit manager of distribution services at Coors Brewing Company.

The Coors Brewing Company of Shenandoah is a finishing and packaging operation which employs approximately 460 people. This year we celebrated our fifteenth anniversary in Elkton, and over this time we have seen our plant grow from three lines and 700,000 barrels of annual production to six lines and 5.6 million barrels of production.

While Coors Brewing Company supports the need for improvement of I-81, we oppose truck tolls as a means of funding these improvements. Our opposition is based on three factors; negative impact on future growth; it places Coors Brewing Company at a disadvantage with our competitors; and a potential negative impact to on time delivery.

Coors Brewing Company is currently in the process of improving our distribution system in the Eastern United States. This project is looking at the Shenandoah facility along with two other sites in two different states for a distribution center to service our customers in the northeast and along the eastern seaboard. This project will build a 200,000 to 250,000 square foot refrigerated warehouse and create approximately 35 to 40 full-time positions. In this competition it is critical that our facility present a proposal that is cost competitive with the other locations. We are concerned that any proposed truck toll will give the other sites a significant cost advantage. This is just one example of the hurdle that the Shenandoah plant will have to clear for every growth opportunity that presents itself in the future. Coors is the number three player in the domestic beer market and our market share is roughly half of Miller Brewing and one-fifth the size of Anheuser-Busch. In 2001 the Shenandoah business unit shipped 35,655 truck loads of beer and received approximately another 10,000 truck loads of materials and finished goods. Based on our close proximity to I-81 we estimate that 90%, or 41,000, of the above mentioned trucks travel some distance on I-81. Because Miller Brewing Company has a plant in Eden, North Carolina and Anheuser-Busch has one in Williamsburg, neither uses I-81 as much as Coors. If we have to pay to move our products to market we will be at an even greater competitive disadvantage. Furthermore, rail shipments are not a viable

option as this takes days away from product freshness, increases damage and most of our customers are not served by rail.

The final concern with what a truck toll on I-81 may do to an alternative route leading into the Shenandoah Valley plant and the resulting impact on service, in our battle to manage our cost of business we would attempt to resist any increase in freight rates from our carriers. The economic reality of this would be for the carriers to use alternative routes and avoid I-81. While this may work for a short time as a cost avoidance strategy, the increased truck traffic on these highways places at risk the excellent record for on-time arrival that our customers have come to expect and also jeopardizes plant schedule if materials are late.

For these reasons Coors Brewing Company asks you to oppose any plan that calls for mandatory truck tolls as a means to finance improvements to I-81. Thank you.

MR. DORNAN: My name is Dan Dornan. I'm vice president with AECOM Consulting, which is a division of DenJim Harris Company. I'm not here to talk about beer. My daughter just graduated from Virginia Tech last year, so go Hokies. My other daughter is at U.Va. so we're in a bit of a dilemma.

Having spent the last four years touring I-81 in both directions it's certainly a challenge for the automobile users of that road, particularly those with small vehicles dealing with the dilemma of up and down traffic, a high percentage of truck traffic and the necessary economic development that's going on in the corridor. I've been to actually two graduations down at Virginia Tech, one my daughter and one her boy friend the year before. One was addressed by the new governor, one was addressed by a current congressman in the area and both talked about the economic potential of the New River Valley. And clearly I think the reason we're here is to address the future going forward and to see whether or not the mobility challenges for the state are going to be part of the solution set as opposed to the constraint set.

I really didn't come to make a speech, even though I guess I have made one, but my real intent was to ask some questions. And what I'd like to do is pose the questions and then sit down and let me be addressed or at least be followed up later. If you look on page 3, and that's really where the major requirements are, in the RFP there are a number of things that are talked about. One is having to do with state coordination, 3 and 4.

It was interesting, I was at a meeting last week in San Francisco of IBTTA, which is the International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnpike Association, and some of your neighboring states, Maryland and Pennsylvania and New York, were very interested in what Virginia is doing. So the context is definitely there for a state to state coordination. What you do here will probably set the stage for

NAFTA related initiatives both in terms of highway the authorization as well as what kind of operational issues should be addressed in terms of consistency if there is toll collection or if there isn't on a state to state basis. The question is what is VDOT doing to try to facilitate that coordination cross state borders?

The second question is on the multi-modal area we understand that the Commissioner is very interested in this project from its multi-modal potential. We also understand there is a separate study being sponsored by Virginia's Public Transportation and Rail group on what to do with the rail corridor that parallels I-81. And there's a lot of interest by Norfolk Southern in terms of double tracking that main line as an alternative to what is being proposed here on the highway. I propose that it may be both things are needed, but clearly one impacts the other and what kind of coordination is going on between VDOT on the one side and DRPT on the other because it raises an awful lot of uncertainty in the process where you have one state agency in effect advancing the cause of double tracking and another agency saying we need more capacity on I-81 where part of the issue is where does the freight go.

A third question has to do with tolling. The question is if the state is looking for this project to be funded how much state funding is likely to be available? I understand that's a very difficult question to answer, particularly in light of the upcoming referendum to be voted on in Northern Virginia. But relating to that if a toll solution were proposed for not only truck tolls but also automobile tolls, would VDOT support the effort as well as the contractor's solution? In other words, to what extent is the contractor you're hiring expected to carry that load? Because that's really a policy decision that has a lot more bearing on the whole region as opposed to one project solution.

Another question has to do with right-of-way and environmental clearances. Will VDOT be willing to take responsibility for right-of-way and environmental clearances so that a contractor can focus on the design, construction, inspection and potentially alternately with operation, maintenance and preservation long term? If you think about the 407 project, the electronic toll road in Toronto, Canada, the province basically took on the responsibility to clear right-of-way and environmental clearances so that in this case the private project venture that took over the road was able to focus its efforts on the designing, construction and operation. Clearly VDOT is in a better position to do those than any contractor, particularly with eminent domain issues.

So those are the issues that I would like some comment on. I thank you for the opportunity and frankly thank you for having this kind of discussion because having been on that road so many times it needs it. Thank you.

MR. MORRISON: Thank you, Dan, and congratulations on your daughter's schooling. She picked a good one when she picked Virginia Tech.

You have three questions here and I wrote them down and two of them have to do with coordination and three of them have to do with--well, two of them had coordination between multi-states and the rail and public transportation and VDOT. The other one was how VDOT supports tolls. And then the last was right-of-way and environmental. You have four questions I guess.

MR. KERLEY: I count five.

MR. MORRISON: You counted five. Malcolm or Fred?

MR. KERLEY: Let me go down the five that I jotted down.

The first question is what is VDOT doing with coordinating state to state. We are meeting with the bordering states that we have. We've met with West Virginia. Actually I'm going to West Virginia next week. We've met with North Carolina. We're going to have a follow up meeting with West Virginia not only to talk about the I-81 corridor but all the activities on that border. We have a follow up meeting in December. We'll have a follow up meeting with North Carolina, I think it's in February.

I have written on the 81 corridor the chief engineers of Tennessee and West Virginia to let them know, sent them a copy of our PPTA log, sent them a copy of the RFP. I've heard back from West Virginia. I talked to a gentleman in Pennsylvania who sent me an e-mail, said he saw the RFP and would like to talk to me. He says if I survive the Valley trip that I would talk to him when I got back. So we do understand the coordination and we're trying to make sure that we do coordinate with them, not only on I-81 but all along the adjacent.

Your second question had to do with mobility and working with the Rail and Public Transportation. If you'll read the RFP under the selection the Assistant Director for the RFP--excuse me, for Rail and Public Transportation will be a member of that. And we are working with them as we address the railroad related issues and they will be participating along with that.

You asked the question of how much funding will the state put into the project. I can't answer that question now because I don't know what the proposal is. I don't know what you're asking our participation to be. If we had all the funds to correct 81 we probably would not have put out an RFP under the PPTA Act. I can't answer that question right now.

Will VDOT support tolls? I can't answer that question from the viewpoint I do not know what the proposal is and what they're proposing as far as tolls. There is, the General Assembly just passed a law that would allow some tolls on 81. If you read the RFP I don't believe anywhere in here the word toll is listed because we're looking for a private entity to come forward with suggestions of how to finance and what to do.

And the last one had to do with VDOT and right-of-way and environmental. It goes back down to how we're going to negotiate the comprehensive agreement. The risk associated with right-of-way and environmental as you pointed out we may be in a better situation. If we leave that with the private entity there is a risk associated with that and there's a cost associated with that. So that would be depending on what's proposed by the proposer and what we reach the final comprehensive agreement with that proposer.

I think I answered all the questions. Did I miss any, Dan?

MR. DORNAN: No. Thank you.

MR. KIFFNER: Dan, you did mention about the potential shifting of traffic to rail. There was a report done in Senate Document #30 last year by the General Assembly of 2001 and they addressed that. If you'd like to I can get a copy of that to you later on.

MR. DORNAN: Thank you.

MR. MORRISON: Thank you, Fred. Thank you for your questions, Dan.

MR. DORNAN: Thank you.

MR. FRINK: Well, thanks very much for having me. You broke my heart when you scheduled this meeting during the cocktail hour. But then I came in and had a plate of very good calamary and a Heineken beer and I signed your name to the tab, Dennis, so when it comes through, you know, just give it the usual.

It's hard to hear people if they point completely to you so I'm going to do this if that's okay.

MR. MORRISON: That's fine.

MR. FRINK: My voice usually carries as you well remember.

Delegate Louderback is not here because he's in Richmond attending a meeting of the State Water Commission, but he has asked me to ask some questions.

Would it be more prudent and accomplish much of the efficiency to three lane in congested areas rather than construct tolled truck lanes?

Has it been determined that it is constitutional to toll only trucks given that passenger vehicles will also benefit from the separation of trucks and autos and the increased capacity of I-81? If the answer is no has it been determined that Virginia residents driving passenger vehicles are willing to pay tolls on the now toll-less Interstate 81?

Depending on the cost, tolls could divert trucks off of 81 and onto non-tolled state roads greatly increasing congestion through cities, towns and villages. Has an analysis been done on the capital operational costs and safety

risks of a Virginia-long I-81 toll booth operation? Would a statewide increase in fuel taxes be preferable, because of apportionment out-of-state through tractor trailers would pay their share, thereby removing the cost of toll booth construction and continual operation and the financial incentive for trucks to divert from I-81?

Assuming truck lanes would be constructed substantial safety barriers must separate passenger vehicles and trucks. Is it possible to build true barriers that are more scenic than the usual concrete barriers now in common use?

Assuming truck lanes would be constructed in a public-private partnership would the Commonwealth limit its liability to an amount certain regardless of the financial success or failure of the project?

Assuming truck lanes would be constructed how many miles apart would the dedicated truck entrance/exits be?

Assuming three lanes or newly constructed truck lanes are there areas with sufficient median space to place plazas/truck parking areas in the medians allowing entrance/exit from the east and west thereby halving, cutting in half construction costs and providing truck driver rest areas? It would appear that such plazas are state revenue producers in Ohio, Indiana, Florida and other turnpikes.

Those are the questions that Delegate Louderback would savor on the note taking. Thank you very much.

MR. MORRISON: Thank you, Gary. You asked some interesting questions, pretty loaded questions I might add. I'm not sure we can answer all those questions here tonight. If either one of you gentlemen would like to take a--I doubt it.

I will just comment on a few things, Gary. You said three lanes versus a toll lane, has there any studies been done for that? No, there hasn't been any studies up to now about economic impact, or would you just rather see a three lane road versus a toll road. But I will say, I would like to point out that the studies, the ten conceptual studies that we did did show that in some areas, especially the urban areas and around certain interchanges, that a three lane improvement in each direction would not handle the traffic that we're projecting out there in the year 2015, but there are some areas throughout the state where a six lane facility we thought could handle the traffic so I will make that comment on three lanes.

MR. KERLEY: Fred, what was the congressional study that was done, is that the one that was number of lanes or . . .

MR. KIFFNER: That we did?

MR. KERLEY: No, that was done by the Congress.

MR. KIFFNER: I don't think they came up with lanes.

MR. KERLEY: I can't answer the question about the

constitutionality of tolls on trucks. And the second question . . .

MR. KIFFNER: I think we have a study where that's going to be that Frank Gee sent over there.

MR. KERLEY: That's correct.

MR. KIFFNER: And we're in the process of treading on those waters right now to find out what is legal and what's not.

MR. KERLEY: I'm trying to go through here and see where these directly come into the RFP that we have.

MR. KIFFNER: The fourth one down there, substantial safety barriers must be separated, of course that would be taken into the design in the RFP of the project.

MR. MORRISON: And again a couple of your questions, Gary, could not be answered until an RFP is submitted to know what the entity or the proposer is going to propose to determine how much right-of-way would we need, can a truck plaza be constructed within the median or not.

MR. FRINK: It was really the intention of Delegate Louderback to get these questions on the record, not so much to get them answered this evening. So we appreciate that.

MR. MORRISON: Thank you very much. Dan?

MR. DORNAN: Just a comment about the truck tolling issue, Congress is being asked to address as part of the authorization dedicated truck tolls, lanes on interstate systems. It is a proposal that is actually coming through advisors to the Bush administration, the Leasing Foundation and others. It's actually getting a lot of attention. Representative Young who heads up the house side of the appropriate committee is actually taking it on as sort of one of his babies even though I think the long-term issue of the whole thing is really going to be in the series as part of the authorization. The point of the matter is they view this as a very logical extension of taking the issue of toll collection to a group in which the ATA has actually come out in favor of it, the American Trucking Association. The big truckers are actually supporting it because of the opportunity to raise truck size and weight limits significantly on those portions that are tolled. And the issue of toll booths and toll construction is actually moot because if you can do it with open road tolling technology, such as they're using up in Toronto where there are no toll booths, no toll collectors whatsoever, you don't need the toll booth, you don't have to stop traffic, it's all done electronically by either transponders or photo recognition right now. So those are a couple of points that I think are underlying this. It's likely that dedicated truck toll lanes may actually be a piloted funded set of projects coming out of the authorization and this is one of the issues that is going to be debated in November in ARCA's public/private partnership annual meeting.

MR. KERLEY: Thank you.

MR. MORRISON: Thank you.

MR. KERLEY: Let me comment on one here because one down here it says assuming truck lanes would be constructed in a public-private partnership would the Commonwealth limit its liability to an amount certain regardless of the financial success or failure of the project. If you look on page 1 and 2 of the RFP there are paragraphs in there that talks about the proposal should focus on short, mid-range, long-range, clearly lay out the financial requirements for each. In every case the risks, including financial, willing to be taken by the private entity must be clearly specified. Risks that ultimately depend on the financial support of the Commonwealth or VDOT or risks otherwise placed on the Commonwealth or VDOT must be clearly specified. So we are asking for that to be clearly specified to us. And as we get into the comprehensive agreement, yes, I would guess that we would limit as much as possible the limit to the Commonwealth or VDOT and that's the reason that statement is in the RFP.

MR. FRINK: Thank you.

MR. CARTER: Thank you very much. My name is Ben Carter. I'm the Executive Director of the Greater Augusta Regional Chamber of Commerce. We represent over 650 businesses in Staunton, Waynesboro, Augusta County and beyond.

After April the 25th of 2002, the board of directors of the Chamber passed a resolution and that resolution was in support of improving Interstate 81 but in opposition to the STAR Solutions proposal that was on the table at that time and in opposition to tolls on trucks which was a part of STAR Solutions' proposal.

Now, since then a lot has happened. As we all know the state has returned the proposal back to STAR Solutions without comment and you have also gone out for the RFP for additional proposals.

Now, having said that the Greater Augusta Regional Chamber of Commerce is concerned that the long-term economic impact of tolls on trucks has not been fully considered and that the impact on the trucking industry, distribution centers and manufacturers who ship their products by truck has not been adequately investigated. The Chamber supports improvements to Interstate 81 and applauds the Virginia General Assembly's offer to make possible public-private partnerships for constructing, financing and operating roads, schools and other public infrastructure. Such partnerships bring the creativity and financial resources of private business to the government procurement. Normally such partnerships produce favorable results. However, the Chamber, area trucking companies and other local businesses that rely on trucks to transport goods are opposed to the imposition of truck tolls to pay for Interstate 81 improvements.

The Greater Augusta County region is home to numerous small and mid-sized trucking businesses. Representatives from the Chamber have contacted many of these businesses, as well as other companies that rely on trucks to transport goods. National and local industry leaders indicate that profit within the trucking industry is currently about four cents per mile. Indications are that the tolls may be somewhat in the neighborhood of ten to thirty cents per mile if tolls are implemented. Added to the already substantial taxes paid by trucking companies such tolls could be devastating to businesses in the Shenandoah Valley. Local trucking companies will be affected more severely by these tolls since a greater percentage of their travel is on the portion of Interstate 81 that's under consideration. This would put local trucking companies at a substantial disadvantage to competitors from outside the area. Because of fierce competition this increased cost of doing business cannot be passed on to consumers.

The Chamber is also concerned that tolls will unfairly increase the cost of doing business for area companies that use local trucking companies to ship the goods and for those businesses that provide services to the trucking industry, such as fuel distributors, repair shops and tire distributors.

The Chamber believes that the proposed tolls may have a severe trickle down consequence. The Chamber foresees that the tolls will result in the Interstate 81 corridor being placed at a competitive disadvantage. For instance, a business that moves its products by truck may not consider moving to our region when it could go elsewhere and pay fewer taxes and tolls.

Simply put, tolls on trucks will increase the cost of doing business for local industry, make local industry less competitive, force some smaller local firms out of business and ultimately cause our area major losses in revenue and employment.

Just several days ago I had a conversation with one of our local trucking companies. That particular company generates about a \$1.08 per mile in revenue. Their expenses are \$1.06 per mile. So their profit is only two cents per mile. So if you take just a conservative estimate of ten cents per mile you don't have to be a rocket scientist to see that you're going to put that company out of business.

The Chamber urges the Commonwealth Transportation Board and the Virginia Department of Transportation to carefully and realistically evaluate the financial data of the impact of tolls on trucks. We also urge consideration of the potential decrease in revenue which may be experienced by the Commonwealth as a result of a substantial decrease in truck traffic on the Commonwealth's roadways due to the proposed tolls. The Chamber urges all stakeholders in improving Interstate 81 to discuss, debate and research other more equitable solutions to the Interstate 81 problems other than tolls on trucks.

And I would like to thank you for this opportunity tonight to speak before you.

MR. HARTMAN: Good evening. I am Jim Hartman, President of Truck Enterprises, a truck dealership based here in Harrisonburg. We along with thousands of other supportive businesses along the I-81 corridor are greatly concerned about our long-term survival and economic welfare. We appreciate the opportunity for public comment that VDOT has made the decision to move through a planning process toward a resolution to the current people and freight movement problem on I-81. The challenge is now placed for companies submitting proposals to think much more broadly, long-term, considering efficiency, safety, practicality and user solutions. They must also assume shared risks.

I-81 is a critically important component of the Valley's fiscal viability. Millions of dollars in revenue annually are transacted with local business operations for goods and services by persons using this major north-south traffic way. Our cities and counties reap huge monetary benefits from this contact, whether it's the truck dealers, petroleum suppliers, truck stops, tire distributors, restaurants, motels and so forth or the shippers and receivers as Ben commented on of the industry. We depend on profitable commerce spending money here.

The proposed toll on trucks, I will not go over all of that which Ben just commented on other than to say we too are very much concerned about the re-routing of trucks, the re-routing of traffic on our state roads, in our cities and towns and the burden that would place on not only the truckers but on time lost, safety and maintenance issues our cities and counties would have to deal with.

Our solution must be reasonable and equitable for all. We don't need eight lanes with segregated vehicle lanes for all three hundred plus miles. Spending billions on passenger and intermodal rail capacity and facilities will not help us in the next decade but may have application in later years. We currently have Amtrak asking for \$1.2 billion from the American citizens to subsidize every passenger that rides their system. Airlines are in serious trouble. Intermodal has limited application and a recent study indicated that it would take 500 miles of shipment to the break even point to be economical on intermodal.

There are practical solutions and I'm sure we'll find them. A sound, long-term plan accomplished in reasonable steps appears to make fiscal sense, but we definitely believe that everybody needs to pay their fair share and we are willing to do that personally and our business needs that. I think the lane issue is a critical part, three where it's feasible or where it's necessary. I think the separation of trucks and automobiles is not necessary. I've been on many six and eight lane roadways over the country where trucks are required to run only in the right two lanes. That allows that left lane or two to run effectively. I think we can

come up with a solution. We're going to pay for it one way or the other. I don't think it even requires a public-private deal. That may be what comes out as the best. But we as citizens and road users, all of us are going to pay for it and I think we ought to work toward fairness. Thanks.

MR. LLOYD: Again my name is Chris Lloyd. I'm from McGuire, Woods Consulting, and we represent Brown & Root, Cullip, Brown & Root and Co-Performance Roads, the two principal leads behind the STAR Solutions team. So let me first begin by saying thank you for this opportunity to be here. Guilty as charged. Since most of the comments tonight have been regarding our proposal, or at least our formal proposal, before it was returned by VDOT. After listening to some of the speakers tonight I'm a bit confused as to how to state a purpose of this meeting which is one where companies and organizations interested in submitting a proposal are invited to talk with VDOT officials at pre-proposal meetings when few, if any, people here have talked about a viable proposal to improve the terrible conditions on 81.

Before I begin with a short statement regarding what STAR Solutions intends to do with regard to the RFP I just want to clarify that any comments or questions I ask tonight do not violate the prohibitions and restrictions in the RFP against people talking to anyone other than Mr. Kerley regarding the RFP or that they constitute marketing of the intent or context of the proposal. Is that the case?

MR. KERLEY: That's correct.

MR. LLOYD: Okay, I just wanted to be sure because those restrictions are there and we were very concerned about those.

First let me begin by saying that STAR Solutions, as many people know, did put in a proposal under the Public-Private Transportation Act of 1995 to widen Interstate 81 separating cars from trucks completely, widening the road from two lanes to four lanes in each direction paid for by a toll on trucks. Legislation was then passed by the General Assembly during the 2002 session which would permit tolls on trucks only if a proposal was put forth under the PPTA on improvements to 81.

I will say that that proposal did move forward until it was returned in August of this year, and we have reviewed very closely the RFP and STAR Solutions does intend to introduce a new proposal before January 17, 2003, for improvements to Interstate 81. The team is looking very, very closely at the RFP. We believe that there are a number of aspects from my original proposal which was returned by VDOT which are similar to what is outlined in the RFP which has been issued by VDOT, including issues such as intermodal movement of freight and people, low bid procurement construction segments, sharing of the schedule and budget risks, a twenty year pavement warranty that was designed to

save operations and maintenance funds and further manage the Commonwealth's risks. We believe that that was a proposal which made a significant amount of sense and many of those elements will be in our new proposal which will be forthcoming before January 17th.

We also have been working very hard to secure federal funds for this project which are essential to its success. I can say that we are looking very closely at a number of the aspects and I'm not prepared at this time to comment on specifically how we will address them. However, I can say that the heart of our proposal will be the separation of cars and trucks and that the actual method and way that that will be done is yet to be determined, but there will be separation of cars and trucks. I think anybody who drives Interstate 81 sees the needs for separating cars from trucks just due to the safety.

I do have several specific questions regarding the RFP itself and specific items in that proposal. They are somewhat random and I apologize for that. The first question, and you can answer them I assume after the end of my comments, VDOT as for the team, flip forward to tab 3, the project financing proposal, my question was how will VDOT reaction to a proposal which is not allowed by legislation adopted by the General Assembly? Specifically will VDOT put forth legislation in the 2003 session to allow tolls on cars or will that be left up to the proposer if a proposer puts forward a proposal to toll cars as well as trucks?

Secondly, under the financing plan, again tab 3 of the proposal, is it acceptable to VDOT to allow truck tolls to be used to upgrade the rail lines since multi-modal is seen as an important element to VDOT?

Third, going to item 2 of the RFP which is talking relieving congestion in urban areas, I wanted some idea from VDOT whether they want to see 81 improvement plans to include something like the completion of the leg of 37 around Winchester or even something such as a Harrisonburg bypass.

Fourth, I wanted to know whether VDOT considers it as important or not to separate the cars from trucks on Interstate 81.

Item #10, which again is the RFP, talks about fiber installation. I just was wondering where VDOT stands with the contract that they had let several years ago in regards to fiber and where it is. I think there had been a statewide contract for installing fiber in the right-of-way and where does that proposal currently stand.

Item #7 asks about short, medium range and long-term ITS solutions for solving or for addressing some of the problems on 81. The team wants to know if the Smart Travel ITS plan that was developed by the Staunton District several years ago, which was actually fairly visionary, should be the model for teams to use across the corridor.

Two final questions. One is a procedural issue. The RFP

outlines that the team should request copies of the CD's and the books from the 1998 improvement studies. If a team already has copies of those do we need to request them again and go through the spending of the money for that.

And then, finally, does VDOT want a--item #13 in the RFP talks about the team should propose items for advance acquisition of right-of-way. I was wondering if VDOT was going to take a leadership role or expects the proposer to do so to do something like the legislation that was introduced during this General Assembly session to allow federal funds to be used for advanced right-of-way acquisition in the 73 corridor. Again, would VDOT expect to take that role this session, next session or would you be looking to the proposer to do that.

Finally give the--well, let me see. I think finally given the statements at the beginning of the conference today or the pre-proposal conference today about VDOT not having enough funds to do this on their own. That is would VDOT consider an option to improve 81 that would not include tolls or any other sort of outside financing.

I appreciate the time to make these questions then because they are very serious questions and we do intend to put in a proposal. One thing I will add. We feel that we had a very viable proposal. We understand VDOT's desire to make some adjustments or have some questions about that. Again we are looking at that very closely. We feel that our plan had a number of economic development benefits. As an example of that I would just note that since our proposal was put forward which did have truck tolls in it two firms have announced expansions in this corridor. One was Sysco Foods up in Warren County and U. S. Food Service down in Salem. Knowing that there was a proposal out there to toll 81 they have created 500 new jobs. So our team does not see a negative economic development impact coming from our proposal. In fact I think most people recognize that road construction itself is a significant job generator which is sorely needed in this economic downturn. Thank you for the time.

MR. MORRISON: Chris, thank you for the questions. We just try to answer them right now.

MR. KERLEY: I should have worked on my shorthand before I came here I'll tell you. I'm going to try to answer the questions, Chris. If I miss one let me know. The first question I believe you asked, will VDOT put forth to the General Assembly legislation to put tolls on cars? VDOT has no intention at this time to put in legislation concerning tolls at the next General Assembly.

Will VDOT allow tolls to update railroads? VDOT's RFP doesn't say anything about tolls. We are looking for the private entity to come in and make suggestions. We will evaluate them when they come in.

I think you said something about are you interested in links,

bypasses, et cetera like that. We're looking for the proposer to come in with solutions to improve the I-81 corridor which would improve anything that attaches to it. If you'll look at the RFP in here one of them indicates connecting roads to railroads, et cetera like that.

VDOT's opinion of separation of cars and trucks. I would like to point out when the Commissioner did give the STAR Solution he did not give it back, we had not reviewed it at the time, we did not make any statements about the quality of that, the pluses or minuses, we had not reviewed that at that time so we had no statement on it. We haven't looked at the separation of cars and trucks at this time.

Are you familiar with what's happening on 81 with the fiber?

MR. KIFFNER: On the fiber option right now that's on hold.

MR. LLOYD: That's the former contract?

MR. KIFFNER: Yes, the former contract.

MR. KERLEY: You talked about Smart Travel, the Staunton plan. If you look at the--in the RFP we note that there is a--actually one of the items indicates that the IPS should be in accordance with the principles of VDOT's Smart Travel Strategic Plan. I'm assuming that Staunton is also in accordance with that. But that's listed on page 2, excuse me, page 3, item 7.

If you have a copy of our CD's already, no, we're not going to force you to buy those copies to give you bookends on it. We do have the CD's, there are a good number of them, from the ten studies, and we also have a notebook where we have assembled a copy of the PPTA law and various things that we would expect any proposer to obtain and be familiar with what's in there. So different places it will reflect studies as well as events.

You asked if VDOT would take a leadership role in--again I didn't . . .

MR. LLOYD: Advanced right-of-way acquisition.

MR. KERLEY: Advanced right-of-way. I think in your statement you said VDOT is expecting somebody to do something. Let me ask . . .

MR. LLOYD: I asked if you were going to expect.

MR. KERLEY: No. These are issues that we pointed out for successful development of the 81 corridor. We are not expecting a proposer to do every one of these. It depends on the proposer of what he wants to do, he or she wants to do, that we put forward that. So we're not requiring any one of these things or a combination of these things. That's up to the proposer.

And the last one, what was that one, Chris?

MR. LLOYD: Using funds for other projects.

MR. KERLEY: Oh, would we accept proposals without any tolls on them. Once again the RFP does not mention tolls whatsoever. We're

looking for the project entity in your ingenuity to help finance the 81 corridor.

MR. KIFFNER: Mel, one thing I would add. On the right-of-way acquisition, we're including in that the company that's making the proposal to do all the work up to the time that the offer is made. Of course it's hard to put in a proposal what those amounts would be. So we have been in our proposals setting it up that the contractor would do the work to the stage of making the offers or even making the offers. As far as the settlement, then VDOT would take on that risk.

MR. KERLEY: Did we get all those, Chris, or did we miss any?

MR. LLOYD: No, that's correct. Thank you.

MR. BENNETT: Good evening. I'm Dale Bennett, Executive Vice President of the Virginia Trucking Association, which is the trade association representing Virginia's trucking industry. Our membership consists of all types and sizes of for-hire motor carriers that are either headquartered in Virginia, have terminals here or service Virginia based customers. We also have as members of our organization suppliers of business services to the trucking industry.

We greatly appreciate the opportunity to be here tonight and provide our comments on some of the issues set forth in the solicited PPTA request for conceptual proposals for improvements to the I-81 corridor. We commend Commissioner Shucet and his VDOT staff for developing a framework for receiving proposals for improving I-81 that allows for competitive bidding and negotiation and provides for a more open process where effective stakeholders can provide their ideas and input.

First and foremost I want to make it clear that the trucking industry and the manufacturing, shipping, warehousing and distribution trucking industry vendors and other businesses and organizations that are members of the SMART Solutions coalition are for improving I-81 to enhance safety, reduce congestion and promote economic prosperity throughout the corridor. And we stand ready and able and eager to work with any proposer in the development of a plan that meets these goals.

Now I'd like to go through a couple of the issues and just express some of our views on them as they're being considered by potential proposers. The first issue, and I've got them numbered how you all have them numbered in the RFP, #1 is the physical separation of commercial and passenger vehicles. The RFP states that separated lanes may be included and can be accomplished through the use of physically separated roadways, lanes or otherwise designated and restricted travel lanes. I would like to point out that under existing Virginia law in locations where I-81 is expanded to three or more lanes in each direction in the future and where the speed limit is sixty-five miles per hour trucks

will already be restricted from using the left-most lane. I believe an earlier speaker talked about that experience in other parts of the country with similar type roadways.

We believe that any proposal that incorporates separating lanes must include the concepts that were set forth in the report of the study of this idea by the recent Public Policy Institute which is the most recent research available on this issue. And I think that is the study that the gentleman here was referring to that was presented to Congress and is getting a lot of attention and discussion and debate at the federal level.

An example of this is that in that study it said that in order to provide real safety benefits the design must incorporate features such as jersey barriers to physically separate the lanes and dedicated truck lane ramps at all interchanges.

Further, if the financing of any proposal includes truck tolls it should incorporate the results of the recent study which endorses a market driven approach to this concept, not a mandatory use, not a mandatory fee to use the truck lane. And that study concluded that the interstate must allow for the use of more productive vehicles in the truck lanes and that use of the toll lanes must be voluntary. In other words, by allowing companies who can take advantage of using longer, bigger and heavier trucks there is enough of a benefit there that they're willing to pay a price to be able to operate those vehicles in those lanes rather than saying to the whole truck population you're going to pay the toll regardless of whether or not your operation can benefit.

And finally another concept that was in that study that needs to be taken into account is that trucks should not be subject to double taxation. That is, not required to pay federal and state highway user fees in addition to the cost of the tolls to use the road.

Also any desire or other measures aimed at improving safety need to address factors involving all vehicles and drivers, not just trucks and commercial drivers. We believe this is a very important issue, especially in light of recent studies by the U. S. DOT and AAA, American Automobile Association Foundation For Traffic Safety. It shows between 71% and 75% of fatal truck/car crashes begins with an unsafe action or a traffic violation by the car driver. If we could take every truck off of I-81 there would still be a significant number of traffic fatalities and crashes that occur on that road. The proposal needs to address all the types of fatalities and all the crashes and why those crashes occur, not just those involving commercial vehicles.

Your item issue #2 deals with the multi-modal facility to shift a portion of the future traffic to rail. Because a large percentage of Virginia's highway money comes from the trucking industry re-directing highway funds to

pay for freight rail improvements will force trucking companies to subsidize their railroad competitors. We believe this would be fundamentally unfair and would represent inappropriate interference by the Commonwealth in the free market system.

While we oppose using highway user fees to finance freight rail improvements, we would not object to the use of other budgetary resources. However, Virginia's residents and public officials should not be under the illusion that such action will allow the Commonwealth to scale back needed improvements to I-81 in the future.

The 2001 EDRPT report entitled "The Potential of Shifting Virginia's Highway Traffic to Railroads", which has been referred to by previous speakers and in some of the answers, concluded that even with a realistic shift of 10% of the truck traffic on I-81 to rail, VDOT's capacity and expansion plans for I-81 would have to continue. These studies conclude that despite most of the rail gains and the VDOT improvements, I-81 will still fail to meet projected traffic demands. Furthermore, the study concluded that the rail investments would not be cost effective. The study found that achieving the 10% diversion level of trucks to rail on I-81 will cost a total of \$2.3 billion. And that's the whole corridor starting up in Pennsylvania and ending up down in Tennessee. Of that amount Virginia's share would be \$1.2 billion, yet the financial benefit to the state would be just \$389 million.

The common misperception or misconception underlies emphasis on freight rail as a solution to I-81 is the issue. That is, the performance value of one is significantly impacted by the level of truck traffic on the highway.

I-81 is certainly a major truck corridor. It is important to understand where and when trucks are operating. I-81 traffic levels do not exceed capacity on all segments all the time. There are peaks and valleys of traffic on I-81 with the worst delays occurring at rush hours in and around urban areas. During these times and at these locations trucks comprise only about 20% of the traffic. Basically the people that dispatch these trucks know that that's a bad time of day to be on 81 and to keep them away. Therefore, any strategy to alleviate congestion on I-81 that focuses only on trucks is essentially ignoring 80% of the traffic congestion problem.

Your item #12 talks about the use and enforcement of varying speed limits. We do not object to varying the speed limits if there is a proven safety benefit. However, we do oppose speed limit differentials between vehicles because we feel strongly that they create a greater safety hazard than what they may be perceived to solve or address. Traffic engineers will tell you, and they've told me several times and there are several studies that back them up, that different operating speeds between passenger vehicles and commercial vehicles results in

increased interaction between the vehicles which increases the risk of crashes. We believe that any speed limit should be uniform for all vehicles. Whether they be 65 miles per hour or 55 miles per hour or 45 miles per hour, they should be uniform for both as the safest approach for traffic flow.

We can talk about speed limits all you want, but speed limit does you no good unless you have the appropriate resources to provide enforcement to make sure that people obey the speed limit. I think we've all seen how that can work as demonstrated by the state police saturation patrols that received a lot of attention in the last couple of years. I know anecdotally, I heard from a lot of our people and members in the Valley that their high visibility definitely slows people down and it definitely increases compliance with traffic laws so we feel enforcement is a very, very important component of any sort of speed limit limitations.

The fifteenth item deals with development and operation of rest areas, including overnight parking for commercial vehicles. We support development of locations where these truck drivers can safely rest. For years we have received many complaints from truck drivers about the lack of such locations in Virginia, including in the I-81 corridor. But in general we believe that this is a service that is probably best suited for the private section; i.e., the truck stop industry. However, there is a problem.

Every time that that industry has proposed constructing such a facility in the corridor they have encountered significant local opposition. I know of at least two locations specifically in the I-81 corridor where that has occurred. And what has resulted either is abandonment of the project or a significant cutting back or scaling back of what was written in the proposal. This is an obstacle that has got to be overcome regardless of whether the state proposes a facility or the proposer under PPTA or the truck stop industry itself. People have got to understand that there is a basic demand by drivers. As a public policy matter we need to make sure they have a safe place to rest.

Finally #19 issue was protection of adjacent communities from undue congestion, traffic diversion, noise and other environmental factors. Mandatory truck tolls or any other financing scheme that places the bulk of funding improvements to I-81 on the trucking industry will result in diversion of truck traffic to other roads less suited to handle them. This diversion will result in increased congestion and a higher risk for truck related crashes on those less suitable roads.

Time may be money for truck operators like Fed Ex and UPS. But Fed Ex and UPS are not the majority of our industry. The vast majority of our industry is made up of what are called truck load carriers who primarily service manufacturers and distributors.

It might help to understand a little bit how they're paid. They're paid to move a product from Point A to Point B. The gross amount of that pay is calculated by a software program that tells the shipper and the carrier how many miles it is from Point A to Point B. Our members tell me that that software figures out miles that are much shorter than any way they've ever known between those two points. Once that mileage figure is given it's multiplied by what the rate is and that's the gross amount of pay that that trucker is going to get regardless of how long it takes him to get from Point A to Point B or what kind of cost he incurs in getting from Point A to Point B. So there is a need in our industry, as highly competitive as it is, to minimize operating costs as much as possible so you can maximize profits on the flat amount that you're going to get paid regardless of how you get there.

As a perfect example of this a lot of carriers are now using route optimization software which is sophisticated technology that determines the most cost efficient way to get from Point A to Point B. So programs under trade names like PC Miler, Pro Miles and Prophecy that help carriers plan their routes to avoid tolls and other extraordinary costs in order to maximize their profit.

In addition to what Mr. Carter already alluded to, the local trucking companies that are in the corridor are the ones that will suffer the most under a significant increase in cost to use 81 because they're located here, their drivers leave from here and come home to here. They accumulate more miles than carriers in other locations in states, that aren't located here that are located in other states.

In addition it would be a major disadvantage to the large national carriers. And a large national carrier, they've got more vehicles spread out all over the country that they can take the cost to their company and spread it out so it's not near as great an impact on the fifty truck operators that have to use I-81 every day to operate having a much higher percentage of their operating costs, the cost to use I-81.

Finally we would wish and hope that any claims that an increase in costs for trucking companies to use I-81 will be offset by benefits, such as time savings or whatever, that if those were made and put forth that they be supported by factual evidence in some sort of an economic analysis that demonstrates that and shows that to be true.

The last item I'd like to address is #20, which deals with development of the I-81 corridor to its full economic potential. Other speakers have covered this much better than I can. I just would point out that 90% of all the manufactured freight that is moved into and out of Virginia is transported by truck. Furthermore, eight out of every ten Virginia communities relies solely on trucks to get the goods and services they need. Again, placing the bulk of financing

improvements to I-81 on the trucking industry will result in increased shipping costs for the truckers and the businesses that are located here. Any financing plan that is put forth needs to ensure that businesses located in the corridor are not put at a competitive disadvantage and that any increased cost of doing business will not hurt the economic development in the region.

Again we thank you for the opportunity and look forward to working with any proposer as well as VDOT people as this process moves forward. Thank you.

MR. CROSSMAN: Good evening. My name is George Crossman. I'm a manager with Con-way Southern Express. We're an LTL carrier. LTL simply means less than truck load carrier. My service center is located off of Interstate 81 in Fishersville close to the town of Waynesboro. I just have a couple of questions. First of all, I thank you for taking my question.

One, has the people of VDOT talked to any of the neighbors to the north? Specifically people in the State of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. I do know that in the State of New Jersey for many years they have had a situation on Interstate 95 where there is a separation between trucks and buses and motor vehicles. And also it was brought up by I think it was the gentleman with the Augusta Chamber of Commerce concerning local tolls. It was my understanding, I could be wrong about this, but in the State of Pennsylvania for a local tractor traveling on the interstate, specifically the Pennsylvania Turnpike, there is no toll charged for local business. I think it's within thirty miles, forty miles, something like that where no toll is charged. Therefore, local businesses can use this without having to pay a toll each and every time. And my company, we use the interstate not only for moving freight from one source to another but for our local use as well.

And, lastly, looking at our U. S. highways, specifically 29, the idea of maybe possibly upgrading that to interstate specs as it is. In the State of North Carolina, which again this might be a short-term solution, but one would allow for less truck traffic and less cost to taxpayers to allow trucks to use that particular road which would take off some of the truck traffic on Interstate 81. I know in the State of North Carolina they have done that and that certainly has helped cities and towns that are off the interstate. That's the only questions I have. Thank you.

MR. MORRISON: Malcolm, do you want to take a shot at those? Have you talked to New Jersey and Pennsylvania?

MR. KERLEY: No, I've got an inquiry from Pennsylvania. I'm going to talk to the gentleman probably next week. I'm not familiar with New Jersey. We can check on that. Fred, are you familiar with any of that in your 81 study?

MR. KIFFNER: In doing the 81 study there is a coalition of representatives in Northern Virginia that covers Winchester and it goes on up to Harrisonburg. It was 81 that goes to West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia in the northern part and they have a group that meets once or twice a year trying to get funds, special funds for that area through there. I know they are very hard at the federal level trying to get funds up there in that section. Mal, on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, I'm a little familiar with it because I travel it a lot, and I'm very curious how it works up there. There are some areas up there that you can travel it locally without tolls, but you've got to realize that road has interchanges like every eight to ten to twelve miles. It's not like 81. So you can't compare the Pennsylvania Turnpike or the Ohio Turnpike to 81. It's like comparing apples and oranges.

The plazas up there are located at certain areas and you can't get off of the turnpike to get to these plazas. You have to take and stay on the through road. It would be nice if we had a parallel Tennessee or Ohio Turnpike to 81 and we could incorporate all the features they have up there. Yes, do you have . . .

MR. DORNAN: Two examples that may be noticeable in terms of comparisons of 81. Take JFK Highway in Maryland. It is a toll road, but the only people that really pay it are the people coming through the state because the only toll facility is at the Susquehanna River. So any commuters coming into Baltimore don't pay the toll. The same is true with Delaware. I-91 through Delaware basically you pay it at the bridge north of Delaware and you pay it at the border crossing. You call it in the industry the chain across the Danube. In fact you're paying about \$6.00 or \$8.00 for about twelve miles of interstate travel. So there is precedent unfortunately.

In the case of this road there are ways to actually toll interstate traffic without impacting local traffic, and it comes down to where you put the tolling facility. It doesn't even have to be a barrier. It can just be a gantry that registers vehicles that go past it, maybe at borders, maybe at I-66, maybe at 64. But there is some precedent there. I would argue that it's unlikely you're going to be able to pay for this from local funds, from federal funds, from even a truck only toll. That you've got really one solution. You've got to find either a sugar daddy out there willing to put a lot of money into this road, and I don't think the tooth fairy is coming to Virginia in the near future, or you're going to have to probably toll the whole sucker which includes passenger and trucks. The biggest problem is what are you going to do on I-95 because you have basically a corridor competition available to you and one solution begs the other. what are you going to do on I-95.

The last point I'll point out, not to embarrass you, Mal, but on page 19 you do have the word toll collection.

MR. KERLEY: I stand corrected. I knew it was in there somewhere.

MR. DORNAN: We know you're not advocating it. It's just a possibility.

By the way, in the State of Florida you cannot build a new highway unless it is a toll road. The state DOT has decided we can't go there. If you want a new highway it's got to be tolled. And they probably have spent \$15 to \$20 billion the last ten years on strictly toll roads and they're full.

MR. MORRISON: The last question the gentleman had was are there any plans to make 29 an interstate roadway in the State of Virginia. At this time there is not. For that to happen it would have to get into the construction program and be identified and included. At this time there is no plans to make 29 an interstate road.

MR. RUNION: I'm Chris Runion, representing the Harrisonburg-Rockingham Chamber of Commerce. Our Chamber has studied this issue and then tried to talk with several of the different proponents of various plans.

We have developed a policy. The Chamber recognizes the immediate and urgent need for the upgrade to Interstate 81 to provide an adequate transportation capacity for our region. We applaud the efforts of the state, the General Assembly and the private companies that have proposed solutions. We, however, urge that the state take a serious look at the short-term and long-term economic impact of both the construction project and any proposed financing solutions. Transportation has been the lifeblood of the Valley region and we wish that it be given adequate consideration for the future.

We would also urge the General Assembly examine historical funding methods to determine if equitable solutions for funding of a roadway can be provided. Thank you.

MR. SAADAT: My name is Sayed Saadat. I'm with CHI Associates, a consulting engineering firm in Virginia, Arlington.

I have two comments, very short comments to make. One is that I noticed on page 5 of the solicitation about the DBE goal of 12%. I would like to thank the Department for putting it in there. Our firm is a DBE. Our survivorship depends on it. I have not seen it in other proposals, this 12%, and I would like to thank you for it.

I would like also to mention that other DBE's who are here and I request the proposers to take this opportunity to approach the DBE firms for potential collaboration.

I have been up and down the corridor a lot because of past projects that we've been involved with. We specialize in applications of hydrology

and hydraulics from a drainage point of view. We have performed more than 150 miles of corridor studies and/or detailed drainage design that cross interstates in Virginia, about 30 miles of which has been along the I-81 corridor. I am very much familiar with it.

There are numerous stream crossings and lots of FEMA established streams and there's going to be a lot of impacts of it as a result of this improvement. On our own we are tallying up the number of streams and related crossings about it. What we're doing is we're making it available to anybody who would ask for it. This will assist any of the proposers for the cost analysis. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Yes, sir, Jay Smith. I just wanted to follow up to a question that Mr. Lloyd had asked and I guess phrase it a little bit differently because I didn't quite think I got the answer. Is VDOT willing to consider a plan that would call for a toll on cars and trucks even though the law does not allow for it at this current time?

MR. KERLEY: Well, VDOT is going to abide by the law. So if your question is--no, we're not going to consider a plan that's unlawful. VDOT will look at all the plans when they come in. I think a question was would we support legislation to put tolls, et cetera, on that, and at this time there is no plan for us to introduce anything at all. But we're looking to what proposals come in and we'll address that. But VDOT will follow the law.

MR. SMITH: But they're willing, just as before, to at least consider an option even if that may be—a change in the law may have to be made?

MR. KIFFNER: We're willing to consider all options. Does that answer your question?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. DORNAN: One of the comments, someone said earlier you're going to pay now or you're going to pay later. About ten years ago Senator Moynihan of New York wanted to get rid of tolls on the New York Freeway. He changed his mind and such created the change in ISTEA to allow tolls to continue and the T-21 to be applied. And what changed his mind was one thing. Every jurisdiction along that road and every community wanted to get rid of tolls, but when they were asked how do you make up for the \$450 million a year that that generates and who's willing to devote their sales tax, gas tax or property tax to it, 100% of the communities, the chambers of commerce, et cetera, came out in favor of keeping the status quo. The point here is that the times have changed. Traditional funding methods for highways are running out of gas proverbial and consequentially the question is how are you going to pay for it. If you want to pay for it, find a way because current sources aren't there. If you want it done, you may have to pay the piper or not do anything. And which is better, not doing

anything or considering tolls? That really is the question.

I –81 RFP Meeting
Pano's Restaurant at Belle Meade Red Carpet Inn
Harrisonburg, Virginia
October 1, 2002
6:00 pm

Clark H. Lewis
Troutman, Sanders,
LLP
P. O. Box 1122
Richmond, VA
23218-1122

Jay Smith
The Public Affairs
Office
2110 West Main Street
Richmond, VA 23220

Dan Dornan
AECOM
Transportation Group
2751 Prosperity Ave.
Suite 300
Fairfax, VA 22031-
4397

Stan Johnson
Geological Associates
of Va.

S. W. Reynolds
STV, Inc.
1951 Kidwell Dr.,
Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182

Gary Frink
1595 Jewel Hollow
Road
Luray, VA 22835

Roy Andersen
The Lane Construction
Corporation
965 East Main Street
Meriden, CT 06450

Michael Howes
The Lane Construction
Corporation
965 East Main Street
Meriden, CT 06450

Dan Leone
The Lane Construction
Corporation
965 East Main Street
Meriden, CT 06450

Kirk Junco
The Lane Construction
Corporation
965 East Main Street
Meriden, CT 06450

Seyed Saadat
CHI Associates, Inc.
2000 N. 14th St., Suite
530
Arlington, VA 22201

Fred Dill

Marsha Scherr
TRW

Kathy Franklin
TriChord, Inc.
12888 James Monroe
Highway
Leesburg, VA 20176

Benjamin Carter
Augusta Chamber of
Commerce
P. O. Box 1107
Fishersville, VA
22939

Arthur & Barbara
Barnhart
Virginia Asphalt
Association

Jim Hartman
Truck Enterprises, Inc.
P. O. Box 4470
Harrisonburg, VA
22801

Dwight Hartman
Truck Enterprises, Inc.
P. O. Box 4470
Harrisonburg, VA
22801

Darell Fischer
JMT
9011 Arboretum
Parkway, #110
Richmond, VA 23236

Mike Todd
JMT
9011 Arboretum
Parkway, #110
Richmond, VA 23236

John Koch
RK&K
801 East Main St.,
#1000
Richmond, VA 23219

Chris Lloyd
McGuire Woods
Consulting
901 East Cary Street
Richmond, VA
23219-4030

Hugh Henry
Washington
Infrastructure Services
2345 Crystal Drive,
Suite 708
Arlington, VA 22202

Glynn Loope
Commonwealth
Advance
P. O. Box 786
Covington, VA 24426

Tim Stowe
Anderson & Assoc.

John Ballard
Woolpert, LLP

John Epperly
Louis Berger Group
203 E. Cary Street,
Suite 100
Richmond, VA 23219

Andrew V.. Bailey, II
Louis Berger Group
203 E. Cary Street,
Suite 100
Richmond, VA 23219

David Feske
Jacobs Civil Inc.
110 North Glebe Rd.,
Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22201

Richard Hauptmann
Bechtel Infrastructure
Corp.
8181 Greensboro Dr.,
Suite 900
McLean, VA 22102-
3823

Roger Bank
Gannett Fleming
5004 Monument Ave.,
Suite 101
Richmond, VA
23230-0883

Larry W. Moore
Gannett Fleming
5004 Monument Ave.,
Suite 101
Richmond, VA
23230-0883

Bill Sibert
Moore Brothers, Co.,
Inc.

Bob Long
American Concrete
Pavement
1805 McRae Road
Richmond, VA 23235

Randy Mullett
CSE
Winchester, VA

George Crossman
CSE
53 Expo Road, Suite
101
Fishersville, VA
22939

Lucinda Nullett
Berryville, VA

David Openshaw
Cherry Hill
Construction
8211 Washington
Blvd.
Jessup, MD 20794-
0356

Steve Chapin
HSMM

Thomas Fleming
TyLin International
2034 Eisenhower Ave.,
Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314

Chris Runion
Harrisonburg/Rocking
ham Chamber of
Commerce
Harrisonburg, VA
22801

Herb Morgan
Fluor
Richmond, VA

Scott Ruley
Fluor
Richmond, VA

Greg Andricos
Cherry Hill
Construction
8211 Washington
Blvd.
Jessup, MD 20794-
0356

Christopher Reed
Michael Baker, Jr., Inc.
1801 Bayberry Court
Richmond, VA 23226

Steve Walter
Parsons Transportation
Group
10521 Rosehaven St.,
2nd floor
Fairfax, VA 22030

Naeem R. Ismaily
Saeed Associates
8136 Old Keene Mill
Rd.
Springfield, VA
22152

Brad Meador
1703 Parham Rd.
Richmond, VA 23230

Dale Bennett
Virginia Trucking
Association
1707 Summit Ave.,
Suite 110
Richmond, VA 23230

John DeBell
Burgess & Niple
4160 Pleasant Valley
Rd.
Chantilly, VA 20151

Chris Gay
BMI
8330 Boone Blvd.,
Suite 700
Vienna, VA 22182

Chris Kiefer
Timmons
711 N. Courthouse Rd.
Richmond, VA 23236

Jerry Augst
Austin, Brockenbrough
& Assoc.
P. O. Box 4800
Chester, VA 23831

William Albeck, Jr.
Edwards & Kelcey
750 Miller Drive SE.,
Suite F-1
Leesburg, VA 20175

Alvin McCullough
MaeBerry and
Company
P. O. Box 10464
Virginia Beach, VA
23450

John Maddox
WR&A
9030 Stony Point
Parkway
Richmond, VA 23235

Steve Beckwith
Open Roads
Consulting, Inc.
709 S. Battlefield
Blvd, Suite 102
Chesapeake, VA
23323

Tim Harrington
News Leader
Staunton, VA 24401

Beverly Tusing
North & South Lines
Harrisonburg, VA
22801

Bill Davidge
Wiley & Wilson
4909 West Marshall
Street
Richmond, VA 23230

Kim Sandum
Wiley & Wilson
4909 West Marshall
Street
Richmond, VA 23230

Gerald Beam
Beam Brothers
Trucking
P. O. Box 183
Mt. Crawford, VA
22841

David Lee
Garth Tech

Doug Houff
Houff Transfer
P. O. Box 220
Weyers Cave, VA
24496

Dick Beadley
Va. HSR

Nancy Finch
VHSR
Daniel Hayes

Robert Longley
Daily News-Record
Harrisonburg, VA
22801

Jim Mooney
Va. Loggers
Association

L. Whitney Duff
Office of Del. Chris
Saxman
Staunton, Va 24401

Marianne Radcliff
Williams Mullen

David Hallock
Office of the Governor
Richmond, VA 23220

Pete Koriegvon
3190 S. Main Street
Harrisonburg, VA
22801

Hannah Twaddill
Renaissance Planning
Group
113 South Street, NE
Charlottesville, VA
22902

Raymond Koenig
Volkert & Associates
5400 Shawnee Road.
Suite 301
Alexandria, VA 22312

Barbara Dean
North & South Lines,
Inc.
Harrisonburg, VA
22801

Walter Miller
North & South Lines,
Inc.
Harrisonburg, VA
22801

Jim Chandler
Fitzgerald & Halliday,
Inc.
6224 Greeley
Boulevard
Springfield, VA
22162

Michael Testerman
Va. Association of
Railway Patrons
P. O. Box 867
Richmond, VA
23218-0867

Carolyn Longelotti
Austin, Brockinbrough
& Assocs.
P. O. Box 4800
Chester, VA 23831